

May 6, 1958

Dear John:

Just received yours of the 3d.

I don't see any advantages or disadvantages to a 'credit line'; the whole point of our 'contribution' was to MASER more expert comments like your own. I would like to make one suggestion that might increase the impact of both our emissions without confusing them. Cowie is going to submit our piece to Science very soon (if he hasn't already done so) and had talked to Wolfe about it long since. Why don't you ask him to run your piece in the same issue -- as he might likely do anyhow?

I'm leaving tomorrow noon-- I hope you kept in mind Cowie's address for any further correspondence during the next couple of weeks. (Dept. Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Inst. Washington, 5241 Broad Branch Road, NW, Wash. 15, D.C.)

Thanks for sending me the note. I don't see any 'omissions or corrections', but I think it may be confusing to the typical reader of Science who does not know the background: I would have thought of quoting the 'classical' theory for the dust in the first paragraph, then following with your amendments.

Yours,

Joshua Lederberg

PATT, J.R.